

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

PETER GRAVES,

Plaintiff,

No. 2:10-cv-3156 MCE KJN PS

v.

HILLARY RANDOM CLINTON
and JAMES STEINBERG,

Defendants.

ORDER

_____/

Plaintiff is proceeding without counsel and in forma pauperis. Based on a filing on the court’s docket, it appears that defendants have been served (see Dkt. No. 21) but have not yet filed a response to plaintiff’s complaint. On March 25 2011, plaintiff filed a document entitled ““Motion to add newly discovery Exhibit”. ‘Exhibit #1’.” (Dkt. No. 28.) Plaintiff filed similar “motions” on March 28, 29, and 31, of this year. (Dkt. Nos. 29-31.) These “motions” are procedurally defective under this court’s local rules, including Local Rule 230. Moreover, rather than seek any sort of concrete relief that is the proper subject of a noticed motion, these “motions” consist of plaintiff’s musings on various subjects including the Supreme Court’s decision in Marbury v. Madison, the Alien and Sedition Acts, Helen Keller, and Shakespeare, among other topics.


////

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

Because plaintiff's motions are both procedurally and substantively deficient, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's motions filed on March 25, 2011, March 28, 2011, March 29, 2011, and March 31, 2011 (Dkt. Nos. 28-31) are denied.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: April 6, 2011


KENDALL J. NEWMAN
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE